

DRAFT Rev 2: 03/19/07

**Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council
December 12-14, 2006 Meeting**

Meeting Summary

RECEIVED
DEC 03 2007

EDMC

Participants:

<u>CTUIR</u>	<u>WDOE</u>
Barbara Harper	Larry Goldstein
	Beth Rochette
<u>NPT</u>	John Price
Dan Landeen	
Gabriel Bohnee	<u>WDFW</u>
	Charlene Andrade
<u>ODOE</u>	
Paul Shaffer	<u>YN</u>
	Jay McConnaughey
<u>USDOJ</u>	Ray Givens
Mike Zevenbergen (phone)	Brian Barry
	David Rowland
<u>USFWS</u>	
Don Steffeck	<u>NOAA</u>
Rich Torquemada	Mary Baker
Toni Davidson	Rebecca Arenson
	Craig O'Connor (phone)
<u>USEPA</u>	
Larry Gadbois	<u>USDOE</u>
Alicia Boyd	Joe Franco, RL
	Steve Wisness, RL
<u>USDOI</u>	Woody Russell, ORP
Jean Rice	Dana Ward, RL
	Jamie Zeisloft, RL
<u>Bureau of Indian Affairs</u>	Annabelle Rodriguez, RL
Q. Brown	Bryan Foley, RL
Dan Noble	Tony Weeks, RL
	Connie Smith, RL
<u>Contractors</u>	Mike Thompson, RL
Roger Dirkes, PNNL	John Morse, RL
Callie Ridolfi, Ridolfi	

December 12, 2006

Welcome

The meeting was opened by Barbara Harper, Council Chair, and introductions followed. The agenda was briefly reviewed and the change in meeting location on the last day was noted. No changes were made in the agenda at this time.

Announcements

Susan Hughs was unable to make this meeting due to illness, but is on the road to recovery and will be at our next meeting.

The group acknowledged the life and accomplishments of Ron Mitchell, who passed away recently, with a moment of silence.

Meeting summaries

Comments received on the October meeting summary, which were limited to one reviewer, were agreed to. Changes will be incorporated into the October Meeting Summary and the Summary will be distributed as final. (ACTION # 150) It was also agreed to approve the January, 2006 Meeting Summary since the outstanding issue (DOE NRDA policy/strategy at Hanford) remains under development. The January Summary will be modified to reflect status of strategy and redistributed as final.

Action items review

Open action items, as described in the October 2006 meeting summary, were reviewed and closed or cancelled as warranted. Those items remaining open, as well as new action items established during this meeting, are listed at the end of this summary.

List of FY 2006 HNRTC Accomplishments

Larry Goldstein, as 2006 Chair, presented (handout) a list of HNRTC accomplishments during FY 2006. The list included the improvement of the 100/300 Areas and Central Plateau ecological risk assessments, successful completion of 3 senior trustee meetings where high-level policy issues were discussed, completion of a Cost Account Plan defining scope, budget, schedule, and deliverables for enhanced trustee participation in clean-up decision making, inclusion of HNRTC component into the DOE-Richland budget request, continued effort on the Data Matrix to identify data needs relative to ecological risk assessments, completion of a Council Finding describing criteria for acceptable 'reference' sites and ongoing reference site activities were influenced by the council input, significant progress on ACTION PLANS, effective conduct of quarterly HNRTC meetings despite ongoing natural resource litigation, significant involvement in unplanned "Inter-Areas" ecological risk assessment workshops, and the organization and conduct of a chromium workshop.

The discussion evolved into possible ways the accomplishments of the Council could be made more visible including the preparation of the pamphlet containing brief description of Council purpose and activities, as well as illustrating past accomplishments. It was agreed council members would discuss with management and brainstorm for next meeting and possibly seek feedback from the senior trustees. (ACTION # 147) At a minimum it was determined that the accomplishments list should be formalized and posted on the HNRTC website. (ACTION # 2)

DOE response to YN PAS

This has been identified as a topic to be discussed at the January 2007 Senior Trustee Meeting. Essentially, DOE is stating more time is needed to collect data and characterize the systems at the appropriate level of detail. Specifically, data collection is ongoing for the ecological risk assessments and data gaps are still being evaluated through the River Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment.

Status of PAS provided by YN

Ray Givens opened up this topic with a thanks for the comments received from trustees on the draft PAS. The YN formally accepted the PAS last week and letters to the various organizations are going out this week. The YN includes an invitation to the trust organizations to cooperate and participate in the next step – going forward with the natural resource injury assessment, starting with development of an assessment plan. Hard copies of the final accepted PAS were handed out to the trustees. The YN notice to DOE also includes request that all data be made available for use in the assessment.

Callie Ridolfi provided an overview of the PAS and described how comments received were incorporated with some exceptions. No substantive changes resulted in the document. The PAS is a rapid review of available information to determine if it is justifiable to move forward on injury assessment. The YN PAS concludes that all 5 criteria to justify moving on have been met. The YN again invited all to participate and cooperate in the process. Either way, the YN are moving forward.

The trustees generally agreed with the conclusions of the YN PAS with some exceptions, but did not feel empowered to make a decision on how to proceed. The council identified the PAS as one of their highest priorities during the October planning meeting. Several options are available to them now, ranging from adopting the YN PAS as is to moving forward independent of the YN PAS, modify as a council, modify as an individual organization, or some combination thereof. It was agreed that the council would develop/define the various options open to them, clarify the points of agreement, and present options at the January Senior Trustee meeting. Senior trustees will then define a path forward, by the council or as individual trustees. (ACTION # 144)

Tank Closure-Waste Management EIS

Mary Beth Burandt provided a briefing giving an overview of the status and plans for the TC/WM EIS. The trustees would like to be more directly involved in the process and have the chance to influence the decisions being made. Four workshops are currently planned to include

the trustees, the first of which is scheduled during February. Discussion topics for the initial workshop include the cumulative assessment and the alternatives being considered in the EIS. Several areas of concern were briefly discussed including; the physical boundaries of the EIS, what alternatives, integration with CERCLA process, uncertainty in inventories, identification of sources of contaminants, quality and quantity of data being used, changes from SW EIS, verification/validation of data, how does it fit with CERCLA decision making, extent of cumulative assessment (stop before reaching river?), injury assessment considerations, inclusion of ecological risk assessment, and consideration of trust responsibilities. Significant concern was expressed regarding the NEPA, RCRA, CERCLA requirements and interactions and how all these are going to be accounted for in the EIS. The trustees are concerned that the less detailed NEPA process might be used over the others to circumvent the open process established under CERCLA. Details of all these have not yet been developed. The intended purpose of the 4 workshops is to work on these issues with stakeholders, including trustees. It was agreed that questions from the council or individual trust organizations should be sent to W. Russell for use in developing the agenda for future workshops. (ACTION # 145)

Status of Integration

John Morse provided a handout and led discussion of the integration of groundwater and vadose zone activities. Council members indicated that they were anticipating information on the integration of risk assessments, the status of the integration team and charter developed under the Configuration Management Group (CMG), and the integration of clean-up activities with NRDA. DOE has reorganized to address problems and consolidate similar activities. Remediation of groundwater is now all under FH. RCC is removing waste from the river corridor. John was prepared to talk about integration of groundwater and vadose zone. The trustees were frustrated because they had requested a presentation describing integration of risk assessments and natural resource evaluations, integration of NRDA and remediation activities, and the fate of the CMG. The CMG has been disbanded as such and activities they were working on have been reprioritized. The trustees also expressed frustration since it appeared that some progress was being made through the CMG workshops and now it appears we're starting over once again. Trustees need DOE's strategy on how to integrate risk assessments. Open meetings are not integration, nor effective involvement in decision making. Workshops have worked well to express concerns and offer improvements to process, however, it is unclear as to how the information is being used, if at all. Feedback would help so everyone understood position on issues and final resolution.

The WCH integration document, which is an integration strategy for the work they are performing on the river corridor, was discussed. This document was portrayed at one point as a strategy to integrate risk assessments onsite and provided a draft list of ongoing assessments at Hanford. This "strategy" has been greatly reduced in scope, limited to a plan for WCH to complete their contract responsibilities. The WCH plan describes limited integration with other contractors as related to the river corridor clean-up but does not mention site-wide integration or present any strategy for cumulative or long-term risk assessments within the 100 and 300 Areas and between reactor areas. The lack of an integrated strategy was identified as a potential agenda item for the senior trustee meeting. YN identified 3 points to be included in true integration: 1) integration of natural resource interests with decision making process, 2)

integration of site risk assessments, and 3) integration of response/remediation activities with NRDA concerns, injury assessment and damage determination. The concerns of the HNRTC will be passed on to Keith Klein and a more definitive explanation of the fate of CMB will be provided. (ACTION # 136)

DOE RL/ORP Site-Wide NRDA Strategy

A draft flow chart of the NRDA strategy that RL is currently evaluating was provided to the trustees. This draft is open for input from the trustees and J. Franco agreed to take comments back to RL management. One of the concerns held by the trustees is that the 'bias for action' approach taken at Hanford that resulted in early clean-up actions could result in interim Records of Decision being changed to final with no further clean-up and without site characterization to validate clean-up is adequate. The NRDA strategy and the integration of NRDA with clean-up decision making will be included in the integration strategy action committed to by RL and under consideration for the senior trustee meeting.

STGWG

Several topics discussed at the last STGWG meeting, including comments by James Rispoli of DOE, were summarized by Barb Harper, including:

- Update on GNEP, including the potential Hanford role as one of 11 candidate sites for recycling spent fuel and using FFTF to do so
- HQ, complex wide nuclear power partnership for new nuclear plants for future energy source
- Long Term Stewardship/Legacy Management: PNSO will have more landlord responsibilities as the Hanford mission shifts from cleanup to science and monitoring. As such, the HNRTC should engage with the PNSO.
- Potential use of Hanford to dispose of off-site low level wastes based on DOE planning relative to risk based endstate, life cycle site, and national disposition of waste stream
- DOE Order 413.3a: performance based management requirements – compliance/noncompliance is treated as risk to a project
- National Association of Attorney Generals has put 3 papers out for comment, with topics including groundwater, cooperative assessment, and NRDA.

December 13, 2006

Action Plans (Resources and Budget, Strategy and Priorities, and Governance)

Handouts were provided for all three of the Draft Action Plans during the meeting. Discussions touched on the high points of each and tried to lead to a path forward to adopt and implement.

The Resources and Budget (R&B) Action Plan, having undergone 7 revisions, was presented by Larry Goldstein as ready to implement. The action plans are guidance type documents that can be referred to in decision making activities. Perhaps the plan could be adopted for the year and each year at planning meeting the plans could be reviewed, modified to reflect current activities,

and adopted for following year. The plans by themselves do not commit resources, however, they do provide a means to leverage dollars and show progress by the council. There was some question as to whether or not the plan is relevant to where the council now is in terms of planning and funding, especially with the potential start of NRDA. The council has operated without Action Plans for 14 months since they were conceptualized so do we need to adopt them formally? The plans provide guidelines for process, not specific activities that we do. Adopting formalizes them and makes the intent of the council and how we do business available for others to see and better understand. The processes should be made to be as efficient as possible. Additional questions followed regarding wording in the action plan and whether or not it really met the needs of the council at this time and whether or not the plan is viable as written. It is the desire of trustees to reach agreement and seek closure on the plans. It was agreed a conference call to discuss further and resolve differences would be appropriate. (ACTION # 146)

The Strategies and Priorities (S&P) Action Plan was summarized by Paul Shaffer. Much of the plan describes and formalizes what is already being done at the annual planning meeting. The goal of the S&P Action Plan is critical in the council meeting their trust responsibilities. The annual planning meeting is the venue through which this action plan is implemented and priorities for the upcoming year are defined. The use of issue managers (not currently done) would insure that at least one council member was tracking the status of, advocating for, and communicating information about topics of concern to the Council. Comments are to be submitted back to Paul and the S&B work group. As in the case of the R&B plan, a conference call will be set up to work through remaining issues and finalize the action plan. (ACTION # 146)

The Governance Action Plan (work group led by Susan Hughs) is intended to allow the council more flexibility in decision-making. It would allow the council to operate in the absence of a member or to make decisions with a single dissenting member. The plan includes some complex issues that will need to be blessed by the senior trustees such as updating the MOU, By-Laws and other key council documents. The question is whether senior trustee managers agree with idea of revising the by-laws and MOU. The fundamental issue is the 'consensus minus one' concept and how to make decisions in a timely manner. There was some disagreement as to whether or not consensus minus one was necessary. Could we couch the issues differently such that consensus could be reached? It was agreed that a paragraph will be drafted by the work group to explain the issue, what it is, how we might approach the resolution, and identify the potential consequences of moving forward on this path. Options will be presented to Senior Trustees at their January meeting. (ACTION # 146)

The group agreed that conference calls would be appropriate for further discussion by 1) the work groups responsible for specific action plans, and 2) the whole council to discuss path forward on all the action plans. The council wide conference call was tentatively set for the 2nd week in January. (ACTION # 146)

Preparation for Senior Trustee Meeting in January

The council identified and discussed several topics for potential inclusion in the next senior trustee meeting scheduled during January. Topics included:

- National Governors Association (NGA) conference questionnaire about CERCLA/NRDA. (i.e., the DOE position on 15 questions) Example is DOE policy on classification as I&I (irretrievable and irrecoverable). The next senior trustee meeting includes an opportunity for the trustees to identify a few of the 15 Q&A topics from the Governor's conference questionnaire for further discussion by Keith Klein. It would be beneficial if the trustees would identify their topic of interest prior to the meeting such that Keith could better prepare. The trustees agreed and will discuss the selections among themselves to preclude multiple trustees identifying the same topic. Dana Ward/Joe Franco will pass the list of topics onto Keith prior to the next meeting. (ACTION # 72)
- What can and can not be discussed at council meetings? There are two issues here – the first is how far Senior Trustees want the council to go toward policy issues, and what needs to be deferred to the Senior trustees. The second issue is how much discretion DOE offices have in being responsive to trustees. This was raised by attempt to include PNSO in HNRTC meeting and PNSO's refusal to meet with trustees as a council, while saying they are willing meet with individual trustees. The council would like clarification of DOE's perspective of the purpose of the council.
- The 'trustee' versus 'technical assistance' issue was discussed at some length, with the issue being what DOE can or cannot pay for. The topic would be to address how we work together as a council and how we don't, depending on the role. Integration of response and NRDA activities would likely alleviate much of this conflict.
- FY07 and FY08 DOE budget and status of Trustee funds. This would also include discussion of impacts of the continuing resolution this year.
- Educational information pamphlet and do senior trustees support providing and using resources to develop this outreach product
- PAS – status in light of YN PAS and council options to move forward
- Restoration, sooner rather than later, starting now with a pilot project
- Review of activity priorities from the October planning meeting
- Integration
- Role of the council
- Governance Action Plan

The council identified the top 5 priorities from this list as:

- 1) PAS
- 2) Purpose of council and appropriate topics for discussion during formal meetings
- 3) Integration
- 4) Governance Action Plan
- 5) Approval to start planning a pilot restoration project

The trustees agreed that a white paper (one pager) for each of these topics should be prepared couching each topic to help the senior trustees while the determine what will be included on next meeting agenda. (ACTION # 147)

In addition, there were actions identified during the last senior trustee meeting that should be considered, as the senior trustees will likely choose from these as well.

- Budget issues
- Technical support

- Restoration proposal
- 15 NGA questions – selection of one by each trustee
- Improved communications with and obtain reports from PNNL
- FY07 budget and funding

The senior trustees will likely establish their agenda based on these inputs and subsequent discussions with the council members. Since the state of Washington is hosting the next senior trustee meeting, Larry Goldstein was tasked with pulling together a draft agenda using the last senior trustee meeting action list and the priority items identified by the council today, from which the senior trustees can finalize their agenda. (ACTION # 147)

NOAA Pilot Restoration Proposal

Mary Baker provided a handout and discussion with the outline of a proposal to start a pilot restoration project at Hanford. An early start to restoration may be beneficial and can have advantages for the trustees, the resources, and DOE. Trust between all the parties is necessary and adequate involvement helps build this trust. The value proposition (value of injury and value of restored resources) can be touchy and sometimes conservative due to uncertainties. Mary Baker agreed to provide a summary of these points for presentation to the senior trustees. (ACTION # 142)

Central Plateau Briefing

A handout was provided and an overview was provided by Bryan Foley, of DOE, describing the supplemental DQO being developed to support the RI/FS process on the Central Plateau. Trustees noted that they were invited to the CP ERA DQOs but were not included in planning for the current Non-Tank Farm Waste Site Supplemental Characterization. Trustees are concerned about being left out of the supplemental planning and expressed their desire to be involved early in these processes. DOE responded that this effort was related to waste site contamination, not ecological risk. Clarification of the connection between the CP ERA and the Supplemental DQO was requested. DOE agreed to provide follow-up information at the next meeting to discuss the results of the Phase 3 sampling. (ACTION # 154)

December 14, 2006

Reference Site Evaluation by WaDOE

John Price provided a status report on an assessment of DOE reference sites being conducted by a contractor for the Washington Department of Ecology. Trustees, with the exception of DOE, were interviewed for input into an evaluation of reference sites. The draft report was discussed in a recent conference call and summary information was provided by John. The final report is due the end of January 2007 and shortly thereafter the report will be transmitted as whole or in part to DOE. EPA will review document before it is sent to DOE. Existing reference sites will be compared to EPA criteria. The Ecology assessment can impact risk assessments because reference site data affects uncertainty in analyses and this evaluation may result in a reduction of

the uncertainty thereby enhancing the risk assessments. Trustees asked if we would know which of the existing sites are best, based on this review. This review does not necessarily answer this question. It is important for all parties to review all reference sites and select the appropriate site for the purpose of the study. YN is concerned about the air pathway and finding a reference site outside the zone of release. Ecology hopes the evaluation will include the limitations of sites and what improvements can be made. Can the trustees engage the River Corridor folks and be involved in site selection? Hypothetically, if reference sites are determined to be unsatisfactory the risk assessments may have to be redone. Ecology is looking for good recommendations to DOE. YN is also concerned about plants of tribal interest and the need to have appropriate reference sites for these. Reference sites versus background sites were discussed. Some entities are using "reference" when an ecological study is being performed and "background" when a chemical evaluation is called for. Most trustees feel background is a subset of reference locations. That is, reference sites may or may not show background or baseline conditions.

300 FF 1 ROD

John Price, Ecology, provided 2 handouts which were excerpts from The FF1 ROD and the FF1 Remedial Action Report. Remedial actions for 300FF1 have been completed. However, groundwater (33FF5) contamination levels did not decrease and remain above action levels. Conceptual model and current understanding indicate that the remediation of 300FF1 will be effective in protecting the groundwater. Contaminant residual in the deep vadose zone will be addressed as part of the 300FF5 operable unit. As such, the 300FF1 remedial actions have been completed and the ROD is final. RODs are reviewed on a 5-year cycle so additional work may be identified at a later date. In addition, final RODs are amendable and can be changed. The point of interest is whether or not the statute of limitations clock has started or not. Trustees agreed they should consult with individual attorneys to determine status and determine if a PAS is needed for this operable unit. This item could also be brought to the attention of the senior trustees. This could also be considered for inclusion in the list of agenda items for the senior trustee meeting.

Groundwater

Mike Thompson provided an overview of the \$10M congressional direct funding received last FY as a result of a GAO audit for groundwater investigations. Direct funding was identified for specific projects and it can not be used for other purposes. The projects were reviewed internally by DOE and then by an independent peer review prior to being approved. Two investigations for treatment of strontium were funded, one involving phyto-remediation (coyote willow) and a second using apatite injection. Greenhouse studies proved effective in the use of coyote willows to take up and remove contaminants (Sr-90 in this case). One concern is the potential for developing an additional pathway through which the Sr-90 could be introduced into the environment and/or become available for biological uptake. The method is ideal when the contaminant is captured in the stem and roots and not the leaves. Tests on the apatite injection remedial technology were also successful and plans are to inject all wells in the Pump and Treat network. Copies of the greenhouse test results and the powerpoint file will be provided to the trustees. (ACTION # 151)

\$20M direct funding had been identified for FY 2007, however, the continuing resolution may preclude distribution of these funds. The FY 07 baseline funding for groundwater is not affected by the direct funding.

Uranium and 300 Area issues

There is an ongoing feasibility study, which includes a risk assessment, scheduled for completion in FY 2008. This includes a groundwater ecological risk assessment focused on the uranium plume. The trustees inquired as to how much overlap/integration there is between this assessment and other ecological risk assessments. The trustees also expressed an interest in knowing and perhaps influencing the assumptions, scenarios, and methodology planned for this risk assessment. A briefing could be set up for the next HNRTC meeting or, alternatively, a power point presentation could be prepared and distributed for use in a conference call if the next meeting is too far out. (ACTION # 148)

NPL delisting process

Concerns have risen about how 'boundaries' of CERCLA sites are defined and accounted for throughout the clean-up activities. Specific questions and concerns were related to how boundaries were initially established, how these boundaries can change with time, and how NPL site closure relates to NEPA and RCRA closeout authority. Statute of limitations may be an issue depending on how and when the boundaries are established and how they are handled during site closure. Work group (D. Steffek, L. Gadbois, M. Baker, C. Andrade, and B. Harper) to prepare draft paper clarifying the trustee issues to include boundaries, closeout strategy, trustee versus technical support, statute of limitations, and process to delete sites from the NPL. (ACTION # 143)

The introduction of DOE's PNSO as a landlord of Hanford Site lands has prompted the questions about how land and any contamination associated with it resulting from past DOE operations will be accounted for during the clean-up and subsequent deletion from the NPL. Larry Gadbois discussed listing of sites and explained that boundaries are not defined when a site is put onto the NPL. Contaminated areas found outside of initially defined boundaries are generally added to one of the Operable Units. Trustees expressed concerns about shrinking or changing boundaries; this concern was prompted by proposed transfer of land from DOE-EM to DOE-SC in the case of 'triangle' in 300 South, and potential 'delisting' of this area. A related concern is how then does the new organization interact with trustee council and meet resource protection responsibilities? Trustees feel there is potential for the loss of habitat without notification of trustees, however, NEPA reviews (cultural and ecological) have been conducted and are documented through that process. This is more complex than some activities in that it is being done through applicable NEPA process on land that is defined as part of a superfund site. Are there CERCLA considerations that need to be addressed in addition to NEPA requirements? PNSO has agreed to meet with trustees as individual organizations but not with the Trustee Council. The trustees acknowledged that this offer was better than nothing and that in the interim individual trustees should pursue this venue. (ACTION # 149)

100 BC Soil Survey

A 'MARSSIM' type survey is planned for areas at 100 BC and possibly part of the 300 Area that have some likelihood of being contaminated (ie, staging areas, etc.) The MARSSIM surveys are required by EPA for radioactively contaminated sites prior to release of the site to verify the efficacy of cleanup and to document that untreated areas are not contaminated. The orphan site location activity will account for areas that are likely to be uncontaminated. A DQO-like process is being followed and work is scheduled for the summer of 2007. MARSSIM, which addressed radiological contaminants, is an EPA, NRC, DOE protocol (www.EPA.GEV/Radiation/MA) and does not entail trustee involvement. WCH has task with DOE to clean land for release and possibly for future release, and is planning the MARSSIM surveys to document that areas are not contaminated. Paul Shaffer requested to see final reports for ALE, Wahluke/Riverlands land release effort from PNNL. Jamie Zeisloft will see about setting up presentation on land release to the trustee council. (ACTION # 152) There was also discussion about a possible presentation on BDAC. Paul Shaffer committed to circulate Kathy Higley's working group (ICCRP) information on biological dose assessment. (ACTION # 153)

Human Health Risk Assessment

The need to begin to think about lost services (human impact) in the ecological assessments was identified. The degradation of ecological system function has the potential to impact the human use (services) of these areas. Human services have not and likely will not be addressed in ecological risk assessments. Trustees identified the need for metrics other than level of contamination to see what losses may have occurred, such as loss of biodiversity, loss of service, and/or a change in habitat suitability index. The human component may be useful in ecological assessments and establish a connection between bio-tissue concentrations and human concentration. Human health (tribal scenario) assessments exist (the CTUIR have developed scenarios) and could be used in assessments. The source Operable Units do use parts of the human (tribal) scenarios in the risk assessments. CTUIR was unaware that they were being used and would like to get more information on this.

Sidenote: The CTUIR have a field station to grow native plants. They are using plant shelter at WSU, Tri-Cities.

Biological Controls Program

Ray Johnson, FH, provided information on the biological database that has been listed on Action Items for some time and explained that it does not exist as a distinct entity. There is a 1994 document, *Historical Records of Radiological Contamination in Biota at 200 Areas of the Hanford Site*, WHC-MR-0418, Rev 0. The contaminants that generally show up in biota are cesium, strontium, plutonium, and uranium. Biological control also includes numerous responses for non-contamination issues such as spiders, weeds in parking lots, mice, etc. The biological control program consists of four components:

- Expanded surveillance – identify extent of contamination spread
- Clean-up – rather than post as radiation zone, contamination was cleaned up and disposed of

- Control – weed and animal control. Keep weeds (spraying and pulling) and animals (remove attractants, alter habitat, and install barricades) away from potential sources.
- Remediation and/or restoration – clean-up site or restore (replant in most cases) in cooperation with Tribes using native plants. Approximately 600 acres per year.

Noxious weed control is part of biological control program and is of growing concern in some cases. Aerial spraying used in some cases (concern is impact to nearby plants) along with hand spraying and pulling of localized areas as appropriate. There is no formal map of noxious weed areas; it would be possible to generate electronic version, but hand written work level map is all there is now. Quarterly and annual perimeter surveys are conducted to determine extent of weeds.

Meeting Closeout

Future meetings:

- March 20-22, Richland, coordinate with 2 scheduled workshops
- June 19-21, Portland – blueberries
- September 18-20, location to be finalized

DRAFT – January 11, 2006

**ACTION ITEMS
12/12 – 14/2006
HNRTC MEETING**

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
2.	<p>WEB SITE:</p> <p>a) Update general information on Web page – D.Ward</p> <p>b) Review update, comment to D.Ward ASAP</p> <p>c) General Review by Trustees, comment to DWard</p> <p>d) Add ERA participation and link to BHI ERA website – J. Zeisloft</p> <p>e) Work Group to Update (SH, LV, BH, DS)</p> <p>f) Put changes into website for review</p> <p>g) Remove phone numbers from website</p> <p>h) Ongoing comments and Accomplishments to D.Ward</p> <p>ACTION: HNRTC, L. Goldstein, D. Ward</p>	<p>9/11/03</p> <p>12/1/04</p> <p>5/25/05</p> <p>5/25/05</p> <p>9/7/05</p> <p>11/16/05</p> <p>3/15/06</p> <p>6/7/06</p> <p>10/3/06, 12/12/06</p>	<p>4th Qtr 04</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
72.	<p>NGA Conf call w/ Matt Duschene; the 17 questions</p> <p>a) provide 17 questions w/answers to members</p> <p>b) trustees review/brief Sr Mgmt for next Sr Mtg</p> <p>c) Each Trustee organization identify a question from list for Sr. Meeting Discussion</p> <p>ACTION: Trustees</p>	<p>9/7/05, 11/17/05,</p> <p>3/15/06, 6/7/06</p> <p>10/3/06</p> <p>12/12/06</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Completed</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
80.	<p>Provide work plan schedules for CP and GW Remediation to trustees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - include budgets - more info needed <p>ACTION: S. Wisness, D. Ward</p>	<p>9/8/05, 11/16/05</p> <p>3/15/06, 6/7/06,</p> <p>10/3/06,</p> <p>12/12/06</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>CP provided</p> <p>Need GW,</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
116.	<p>Comments on WCH 'Integration Plan' due mid-August.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate individual inputs • Comments due Jan 12 <p>ACTION: Trustees</p>	<p>6/8/07</p> <p>10/5/06</p> <p>12/12/06</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
125.	<p>Work Group (B. Harper – lead, L.Gadbois, L. Goldstein, D. Ward, D. Steffeck, J. Concannon)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calendar of events or matrix of (TPA milestones, OUs, TSDs, etc.) - Legal review/interpretation – tolling agreement?, regulatory clock start? <p>ACTION: Work Group, D. Steffeck, B. Harper</p>	<p>10/4/06</p> <p>12/12/06</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
126.	<p>300 Area uranium issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agenda item next HNRTC meeting - 300 Uranium plume conference call 	<p>10/4/06</p> <p>12/14/06</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	- March HNRTC meeting agenda ACTION: M. Thompson	12/14/06	
130.	RCRA – NRDA connection Work Group: D. Steffek (lead), J. Concannon, C. Andrade - White paper for trustee review - Possible agenda item next HNRTC meeting ACTION: D. Steffek, Work Group	10/4/06 12/13/06	Ongoing
133.	Finalize Governance Action Plan and prepare brief for Senior Trustees - final draft to HNRTC next council meeting - talking points/presentation for Sr trustees mtg ACTION: S. Hughs	10/4/06 12/13/06	
136.	RL plan/vision for 'integration' of risk assessments at Hanford. - Trustees to provide info on past effort to D. Ward - high level RL presentation at next HNRTC meeting - Sr. Trustee Mtg Agenda topic and March HNRTC meeting agenda topic - 'paragraph' for Sr. Trustee Mtg ACTION: Trustees, J. Franco, D. Ward	10/4/06 10/4/06 12/12/06 12/13/06	Ongoing Ongoing
142.	Potential for Restoration: Now or Later - summarize presentations to date including potential restoration options - HNRTC concerns to M. Baker - Agenda item at next HNRTC meeting and potential for Senior Trustee agenda - Summarize advantages to Trustees, to resources, to DOE ACTION: M. Baker	10/5/06 12/13/06	Done Done Done Ongoing
143.	NPL listing clarification of boundaries, trustee versus technical support, closeout strategy, statute of limitation clock, and de-listing ACTION: B. Harper, D. Steffek, L. Gadbois, C. Andrade	12/12/06	
144.	YN PAS: • Options paper • Trustees define path forward ACTION: M. Baker, B. Harper, HNRTC	12/12/06 12/12/06	
145.	TW EIS: 1) Council questions to W. Russell on TW EIS for incorporation/organization of upcoming workshops. 2) Agenda for March HNRTC meeting	12/12/06 12/12/06	

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	ACTION: Trustees, W. Russell		
146.	Action Plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work groups revise independently • HNRTC Conf Call to discuss as whole • Governance paragraph/sale to Sr Trustees ACTION: Work groups, Trustees, S. Hughs	12/12/06 12/12/06 12/12/06	
147.	Senior Trustee Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph(s) couching potential meeting topics, including PAS, Integration, trustee vs tech support, governance, restoration, • Present potential agenda items and list of HNRTC accomplishments for 2006 • Seek feedback from senior trustees on 'educational' pamphlet and expenditure of resources to prepare it ACTION: Trustees, L. Goldstein	12/12/06 12/12/06 12/12/06	
148.	300FF5 conference call status ACTION: M. Thompson, D. Ward	12/14/06	
149.	PNSO role in Natural Resource Protection: Engage J. Erickson as individual trustee(s) ACTION: Trustees	12/14/06	
150.	Revise January and October Meeting Summaries per trustee comments and distribute as final. ACTION: D. Ward, R. Dirkes	12/12/06	
151.	Provide copy of 100N Sr-90 coyote willow greenhouse study report to trustees ACTION: M. Thompson	12/13/06	
152.	Discuss potential presentation on land release (ALE, McGee Ranch/Riverlands/Wahluke Slope) at Hanford ACTION: J. Zeisloft, W. Glines	12/13/06	
153.	Circulate Kathy Higley's (OSU) information package on biological dose assessment ACTION: P. Shaffer	12/14/06	
154.	Present results of CP Phase 3 Sampling at next HNRTC meeting. ACTION: B. Foley	12/13/06	

DRAFT –December 19, 2006

**ACTION ITEMS
12/12 – 14/2006
HNRTC MEETING**

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
2.	WEB SITE: a) Update general information on Web page – D.Ward b) Review update, comment to D.Ward ASAP c) General Review by Trustees, comment to DWard d) Add ERA participation and link to BHI ERA website – J. Zeisloft e) Work Group to Update (SH, LV, BH, DS) f) Put changes into website for review g) Remove phone numbers from website h) Ongoing comments and Accomplishments to D.Ward ACTION: HNRTC, L. Goldstein, D. Ward	9/11/03 12/1/04 5/25/05 5/25/05 9/7/05 11/16/05 3/15/06 6/7/06 10/3/06, 12/12/06	4 th Qtr 04 Done Done Done Done Done Ongoing
72.	Governor's Conf call questionnaire – a) provide 17 questions w/answers to members b) trustees review/brief Sr Mgmt for next Sr Mtg c) Each Trustee organization identify a question from list for Sr. Meeting Discussion ACTION: Trustees	9/7/05, 11/17/05, 3/15/06, 6/7/06 10/3/06 12/12/06	Done Completed Done Ongoing
80.	Provide work plan schedules for CP and GW Remediation to trustees - include budgets - more info needed ACTION: S. Wisness, D. Ward	9/8/05, 11/16/05 3/15/06, 6/7/06, 10/3/06, 12/12/06	Ongoing CP provided Need GW, Ongoing
116.	Comments on WCH 'Integration Plan' due mid-August. • Coordinate individual inputs • Comments due Jan 12 ACTION: Trustees	6/8/07 10/5/06 12/12/06	Ongoing Ongoing Ongoing
125.	Work Group (B. Harper – lead, L.Gadbois, L. Goldstein, D. Ward, D. Steffek, J. Concannon) - Calendar of events or matrix of (TPA milestones, OUs, TSDs, etc.) - Legal review/interpretation – tolling agreement?, regulatory clock start? ACTION: Work Group, D. Steffek, B. Harper	10/4/06 12/12/06	Ongoing

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
126.	300 Area uranium issues - agenda item next HNRTC meeting - 300 Uranium plume conference call - March HNRTC meeting agenda ACTION: M. Thompson	10/4/06 12/14/06 12/14/06	Ongoing
130.	RCRA – NRDA connection Work Group: D. Steffek (lead), J. Concannon, C. Andrade - White paper for trustee review - Possible agenda item next HNRTC meeting ACTION: D. Steffek, Work Group	10/4/06 12/13/06	Ongoing
133.	Finalize Governance Action Plan and prepare brief for Senior Trustees - final draft to HNRTC next council meeting - talking points/presentation for Sr trustees mtg ACTION: S. Hughs	10/4/06 12/13/06	
136.	RL plan/vision for ‘integration’ of risk assessments at Hanford. - Trustees to provide info on past effort to D. Ward - high level RL presentation at next HNRTC meeting - Sr. Trustee Mtg Agenda topic and March HNRTC meeting agenda topic - ‘paragraph’ for Sr. Trustee Mtg ACTION: Trustees, J. Franco, D. Ward	10/4/06 10/4/06 12/12/06 12/13/06	Ongoing Ongoing
142.	Potential for Restoration: Now or Later - summarize presentations to date including potential restoration options - HNRTC concerns to M. Baker - Agenda item at next HNRTC meeting and potential for Senior Trustee agenda - Summarize advantages to Trustees, to resources, to DOE ACTION: M. Baker	10/5/06 12/13/06	Done Done Done Ongoing
143.	NPL listing clarification of boundaries, trustee versus technical support, closeout strategy, statute of limitation clock, and de-listing ACTION: B. Harper, D. Steffek, L. Gadbois, C. Andrade	12/12/06	
144.	YN PAS: • Options paper • Trustees define path forward ACTION: M. Baker, B. Harper, HNRTC	12/12/06 12/12/06	
145.	TW EIS:		

	ASSIGNEE / ACTION	Date Assigned	Date Completed
	1) Council questions to W. Russell on TW EIS for incorporation/organization of upcoming workshops. 2) Agenda for March HNRTC meeting ACTION: Trustees, W. Russell	12/12/06 12/12/06	
146.	Action Plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work groups revise independently • HNRTC Conf Call to discuss as whole • Governance paragraph/sale to Sr Trustees ACTION: Work groups, Trustees, S. Hughs	12/12/06 12/12/06 12/12/06	
147.	Senior Trustee Meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph(s) couching potential meeting topics, including PAS, Integration, trustee vs tech support, governance, restoration, • Present potential agenda items and list of HNRTC accomplishments for 2006 ACTION: Trustees, L. Goldstein	12/12/06 12/12/06	
148.	300FF5 conference call status ACTION: M. Thompson, D. Ward	12/14/06	
149.	PNSO role in Natural Resource Protection: Engage J. Erickson as individual trustee(s) ACTION: Trustees	12/14/06	